10 RS. COURT FEE 10 RS. भारत INDIA दस रुपये TEN RUPEES CANCELLED

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR (CHHATTISGARH)

MISC. CIVIL CASE NO. 96 OF 2005

APPLICANT

Raipur Development Authority, The body incorporated under Chhattisgarh Nagar Tatha Gram Nivesh Adhiniyam,1973, Having Its Office Near Bajarang Mandir, G. E. Road, Raipur Through its Chief Executive Officer, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

VERSUS

NON-APPLICANTS

1. Shri Manish Kumar, S/o Shri Hari Prasad, aged about 36 years, R/o Civil Lines, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. State of Chhattisgarh through The Secretary, Environment & Urban Development Department Mantralaya, Dau Kalyan Singh Bhawan, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Municipal Corporation Raipur, a body incorporated, Under Sec.-7 of CG Municipal Corporation Act, 1956, having Its office at Malviya Road, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

P.R. No. 1174 dt. 30.5 Presented by Shri ... dated 30.05.05

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMPLETING THE PROCEEDINGS IN COMPLIANCE OF ORDER DATED 15-02-2005 PASSED BY THE HON'BLD COURT IN W.P.NO.1343/2002

आयुक्त,

The Applicant, named above, most respectfully begs to submit as

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..... MCC 96/05 ..... **सन् 200**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	31-8-2006 Shri Manindra Shrivastava, Sr. Adv. with Smt. Smita Ghai, Adv. for the applicant. Shri P. Diwakar, Sr. Adv. with Shri P.R. Patankar, Adv. for the respondent no. 1. Shri Prashant Mishra, Addl. Adv. General with Shri U.N.S. Deo, Govt. Adv. for the State. Heard. This is an application for extension of time for completing the proceedings in compliance of order dated 15-2-2005 passed by this Court in W.P. 1343/2002. While disposing of the W.P. No. 1343/2002, a direction was given to the petitioner therein to submit a suitable representation before the Raipur Development Authority within 15 days, which was to be decided by the Raipur Development Authority, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the representation in accordance with resolution. Counsel for the petitioner submits that orders could not be passed in time but subsequently orders have been passed. Since orders have been passed by the petitioner, this petition has become infructuous. The petition is dismissed as infructuous. **Sd/-** **Fakhruddin** **Judge**	

P.T.O.